

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2022/0278
Valid 25/05/2022

22 ASH GROVE
WERRINGTON

PROPOSED SIDE EXTENSION
TO EXISTING DWELLING

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

The impact on the character and appearance of the area.
The impact on residential amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site is within the built-up part of Werrington, within the development boundary, and lies to the west of the centre of the village. It comprises a typical 1930s brick and tile semi-detached dwellinghouse which is one of a row of similar dwellings which face Ash Grove cul-de-sac to the west. There are also other similar dwellings opposite to the other side of the road which also face it and further dwellings to the rear (to the east).

PROPOSAL

This is a full householder planning application for a two-storey side extension and the widening of an existing rear single-storey extension across the back of the two-storey side extension, with a new pitched lean to roof. The extensions would span up to the side boundary. A low angle lean-to roof would be placed on top of the whole single-storey rear extension (the existing part is flat-roofed) including the extended part. The extensions would have matching red brick wall materials and grey tile roofing materials.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffs Moorlands Local Plan (adopted July 2021)

DC1 Design Considerations

NPPF (Revised July 2021)

Sections 12 (Design).

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 7.7.22

Neighbour consultation period ends: 7.7.22

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

One letter of objection has been received from the immediate neighbour to the south concerned that the side extension would lead to a loss of light to her home, the impact on her privacy and the proximity to her property.

Parish Council Comments

None.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The site lies within the built up boundary for Werrington, where development will be directed in accordance with Policies SS2 and SS8.

The extension is less than half the width of the house and in terms of its scale, height, form (including hipped roof form), materials and fenestration, would harmonise with the host dwelling. The front wall of the extension has been slightly recessed behind the main front wall and the roof ridge also dropped slightly below the main roof ridge so that the extension respects the dominance of the existing main part of the dwelling and appears subservient to it, in accordance with the Council's Design Guide. The extension to the single-storey rear extension and addition of a low-pitched roof would also not harm the dwelling and would in fact improve the appearance of the extension although this part would not be visible from the road or public footpaths in any case.

Although the side extension would project up to the side boundary and hence close the gap between it and the neighbour at number 20, affecting the gaps which are characteristic of the street scene often found on a residential street of standard semi-detached houses, a very similar extension exists at a semi-detached house (no.26) a short distance further north along the road and on the same side. The dwelling there is the same design as the dwelling on site and the extension, approved under a 2015 planning permission (ref: SMD/2015/0118) and which also is built up to the side boundary, has the same relationship to the street scene and house, as to the extension proposed under this application. I therefore consider that the proposed extension would not be out of keeping with the area or harmful to the street scene.

I note the comments by the neighbouring property. With regard to residential amenity, the extension will not project any further forward or rearward of the front and rear walls of the two neighbouring dwellings which both also have rear extensions and so the light into front and rear windows of other dwellings will not be affected. However, there is a large ground floor window and a smaller window above on the flank wall of the neighbouring house, facing the proposed side extension which would bring the house closer to the neighbours house as it would be built up to the shared side boundary. The window is a side window to an extended kitchen. There is another window of significant size facing the rear and I consider this to be the main source of light to the extended kitchen as, unlike the side window, it does not face an existing two-storey flank wall. Although the proposed extension will bring the house closer to the side kitchen window, resulting in some light loss, I do not consider this to be significantly harmful to the overall residential amenities of the neighbours as it is a secondary window and not the main source of light into the kitchen. This is a very similar situation to the side extension to the nearby house approved in 2015 where the neighbours house also had a single-storey rear kitchen enlargement resulting in the main windows being in the rear wall of the extension and not the one at the side. This was also considered to not result in harm to the residential amenities of the neighbours. Overall, I do not consider the proposal would result in a harmful loss of light to neighbouring properties.

In terms of privacy, there would be no windows proposed for the side wall facing the property to the south. There would be a rear upper floor bedroom window close to the side boundary but views from this would be restricted to the rear part of the neighbours back garden to the south and also partly obscured by the presence of a rear outbuilding at that same property. I do not consider the scope of overlooking would be so harmful as to materially affect the levels of privacy enjoyed by the neighbour.

As the proposal would result in a fourth bedroom being created, the Council's parking standards would require the provision of three on-site parking spaces. I am satisfied that this can be accommodated to the front of the house via additional hard-surfacing and the widening of the access involving the removal of part of the front boundary hedge. An amended site plan was submitted to demonstrate this.

Whilst the extension would be positioned almost on the common boundary, if any access is required to the neighbours land, this would be a civil matter for both parties to resolve.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposal would not harm the visual or residential amenities of the area. The proposal would therefore comply with the Local Plan and the government planning guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Chris Johnston
Recommendation Date: 21.7.22

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council